

Date: Tue, 13 Apr 93 04:30:18 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #94
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Tue, 13 Apr 93 Volume 93 : Issue 94

Today's Topics:

1500 watts too much? (4 msgs)
 CW = effective utilization?
 motive ...
Remote control of ATV (2 msgs)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Tue, 13 Apr 1993 00:44:43 GMT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!emory!athena!
aisun3.ai.uga.edu!mcovingt@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: 1500 watts too much?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In a recent issue of _RF Design_ there was a letter from an engineer who
feels that, now that EMI susceptibility is becoming a real concern of the
industry (hooray!), the amateur radio 1500 watt limit should be lowered.

His rationale is that it's simply unreasonable to expect consumer electronic
gear to work properly right next to a 1500-watt radio station. He feels
1500 watts is simply too much to use in a residential area.

What do you all think?

(NO EMAIL REPLIES; participate in the _public_ discussion!)

--

:- Michael A. Covington, Associate Research Scientist : *****

: - Artificial Intelligence Programs mcovingt@ai.uga.edu : *****
: - The University of Georgia phone 706 542-0358 : * * *
: - Athens, Georgia 30602-7415 U.S.A. amateur radio N4TMI : ** *** ** <><

Date: 13 Apr 93 02:21:00 GMT
From: swrinde!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!ub!acsu.buffalo.edu!ubvmsb.cc.buffalo.edu!
v111qheg@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: 1500 watts too much?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <C5ECqK.Hr3@athena.cs.uga.edu>, mcovingt@aisun3.ai.uga.edu (Michael Covington) writes...

>In a recent issue of _RF Design_ there was a letter from an engineer who
>feels that, now that EMI susceptibility is becoming a real concern of the
>industry (hooray!), the amateur radio 1500 watt limit should be lowered.
>

>His rationale is that it's simply unreasonable to expect consumer electronic
>gear to work properly right next to a 1500-watt radio station. He feels
>1500 watts is simply too much to use in a residential area.
>

>What do you all think?

Other than beating raging pile-ups over the rarest DX during low sunspot numbers and during contests, you shouldn't need to use QR0. 100 watts and a dipole or a tribander is more than adequate for local (national) QSO's and most DX contacts. Peter, XT2BW, does quite well with a full wave loop for 40 Meters and his Kenwood 440. I have done very well with an extended double zepp and my 25 year old tribander.

Anyway, getting back to the point, RF dissipation is quite strong. Assuming your neighbors are the average 100 feet away from your antenna, your 1.5 Kw does not pose much of a threat. Or should not. Therefore, IMHO, my running legal limit during contests or DXing should not matter, since you are not in as much danger as I am with the 60 cycle power supply sitting three feet from the operating position.

As for equipment, if it cannot operate in an environment with power spikes and RF, then it is shoddy equipment, IMO. I'll take an old Heathkit scope over the Kenwood Station Monitor anyway as it is built like a brick. BTW, if you have an effective grounding system, these sorts of problems should be rare.

Just my \$.02 worth.

>(NO EMAIL REPLIES; participate in the _public_ discussion!)

>--

>:- Michael A. Covington, Associate Research Scientist : *****
>:- Artificial Intelligence Programs mcovingt@ai.uga.edu : *****

>:- The University of Georgia phone 706 542-0358 : * * *
>:- Athens, Georgia 30602-7415 U.S.A. amateur radio N4TMI : ** *** ** <><

Peter Vasilion, KB2NMV Western NY DX Association
v111qheg@ubvms.cc.buffalo KN2M Contest Crew
KB2NMV@KE2VW.#WNY.NY.USA.NA W2SEX Field Day Team

Hpe C U at Dayton. Stop by WNYDXA hospitality Suite at the Stouffers.

My opinios only.

Date: Tue, 13 Apr 1993 02:59:45 GMT
From: sdd.hp.com!ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!news.cso.uiuc.edu!uxa.cso.uiuc.edu!
pereckas@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: 1500 watts too much?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

mcovingt@aisun3.ai.uga.edu (Michael Covington) writes:

>His rationale is that it's simply unreasonable to expect consumer electronic
>gear to work properly right next to a 1500-watt radio station. He feels
>1500 watts is simply too much to use in a residential area.

>What do you all think?

I need only walk a few blocks to see houses located at the base of a tower owned by a FM radio station. I assume they use more than 1500 watts. In fact, they are responsible for quit a bit of interference to phones and stereo equipment throughout town (not just to the people next door). There is a TV transmitter across the road from several houses out in a rural area not far from here. What about those multi-kW paging transmitters? Ham radio is not the most intense source of RF around. Further, some hams live in town, some live on farms. Maybe 1500 W is a bit much in an apartment, but out on a farm, why not? A short drive through farm country adjacent to even a small city will reveal plenty of commercial transmitters, some no doubt with 100+ kW ERPs. A 1.5 kW amateur transmitter should be no problem out there, with your neighbor some distance away---about the same distance as the neighbors of a commercial transmitter are from it. Some judgment on the part of hams is probably called for---running the legal limit in your apartment through a stealth antenna than runs 1 foot from your neighbor's TV is probably not wise. Limiting all hams to 500 W or 100 W is not necessary.

(Passed no-code tech, still waiting for my call, and working on my code.)

--
Michael Pereckas pereckas@uxa.cso.uiuc.edu

Date: 13 Apr 93 03:31:20 GMT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!spool.mu.edu!olivea!pagesat!spssig.spss.com!
feenix.metronet.com!marcbg@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: 1500 watts too much?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

```
In article <C5ECqK.Hr3@athena.cs.uga.edu> mcovingt@aisun3.ai.uga.edu
  (Michael Covington) writes:
>In a recent issue of _RF Design_ there was a letter from an engineer who
>feels that, now that EMI susceptibility is becoming a real concern of the
>industry (hooray!), the amateur radio 1500 watt limit should be lowered.
>His rationale is that it's simply unreasonable to expect consumer electronic
>gear to work properly right next to a 1500-watt radio station.  He feels
>1500 watts is simply too much to use in a residential area.
>What do you all think?
```

I could see that someone could have that opinion. However, with a properly operating amateur radio station, interference should be minimal. This includes proper grounding techniques, proper loading techniques, etc., (but, read on...)

I think the real threat comes with VHF and UHF and satellite ops. Its easy to get into TV sets at these frequencies, especially the way new TV sets are designed.

I don't know too many operators that operate 1.5Kw in a residential area. Most can't, they get will too much interference - ANY interference, no matter how minimal, is too much to the wrong neighbor.

One side note - KRLD, a local AM broadcast station, has no problem operating their 50KW transmitter in a residential area in Garland, Texas. Yes, they generate interference, and you can pick them up all over the dial if you're not far from the transmitter. But see, they're a big broadcast station and they can do that kind of stuff

```
--
|Marc Grant           | Internet: marcbg@feenix.metronet.com |
|POB 850472          | Amateur Radio Station N5MEI          |
|Richardson, TX 75085| Voice/Fax: 214-231-3998              |
- . . . . - - . . . - - . . . . . . . - - . . . - - . . .
```

Date: Tue, 13 Apr 1993 00:20:26 GMT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!magnus.acs.ohio-state.edu!
csn!csn!stortek!georgen@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: CW = effective utilization?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Apr8.155021.3317@nntpd2.cxo.dec.com> little@nuts2u.enet.dec.com
(nuts2u::little) writes:

>
>Please note, I'm not trying to bash CW, I'm just trying to understand why
>it gets preferential treatment and is forced down everyone's throat. Aside
>
>Todd
>N9MWB

Well, its real simple..... CW was the FIRST mode of communications used in
radio communications. If it was packet, then maybe packet would be
preferentially treated.

73
George
W1XE

Date: Mon, 12 Apr 1993 14:39:30 GMT
From: pipex!bnr.co.uk!corpgate!brtph560!nrtpa038!node_17aa4!kme@uunet.uu.net
Subject: motive ...
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <LHuq2B1w165w@jackatak.raider.net>, jackhill@jackatak.raider.net (Jack
GF Hill) writes:

|>
|> What these people want, Ken (and others) is NOT that you adopt their
|> "lifestyle", but that you simply accord to them the rights they have
|> as human beings, and not attempt to diminish them simply because in
|> your narrow mind and miniscule little heart you can not bring yourself
|> to be a decent human being and abide by the "live and let live"
|> principles.

Please do not judge me. I was posting to the originator of this thread
who DID WANT special treatment for a group of people. If it had been a
religious group, my COMMENTS WOULD HAVE BEEN THE SAME. The ARRL should
not be in the position of forwarding political agendas (including those
of a church).

|>
|> You can look the other way when an advertisement for a missionary net,

|> or the Jewish hams appears, but leap up in self-righteous fervor and
|> jump to the conclusion that a simple announcement for a Ham radio
|> group, wishing to be able to more easily contact each other without
|> having to ask, on the air, and stir up all you maniacal homophobes,
|> whether the person they are addressing shares some significant life
|> pattern.

You do not even know me. How can you make this determination ?

|> Do everyone a favor, and unless you have something CONSTRUCTIVE to
|> add, don't jump in simply to demonstrate your manifold intolerance and
|> bigotry...it doesn't become you...

I believe it is you sir, that has jumped in, to show manifold intolerance.

=====

Ken M. Edwards, Bell Northern Research, Research Triangle Park, NC
(919) 481-8476 email: cnc23a@bnr.ca Ham: N4ZBB

All opinions are my own and do not necessarily reflect the views of
my employer or co-workers, family, friends, congress, or president.

"You'd better call my dad...My mom's pretty busy."
- Chelsea Clinton

Date: Mon, 12 Apr 1993 15:33:17 GMT
From: infonode!ingr!b8!ldf.b24a.ingr.com!ldfrost@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Remote control of ATV
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <186072@pyramid.pyramid.com>, andrem@pyrtech.mis.pyramid.com (Andre Molyneux) writes:

|>
|> I have a question regarding the ATV transmissions and whether or not
|> they can legally be controlled remotely. I'm a member of the
|> Nor-Cal Shelby club, and am hoping to set up an in-car camera at
|> one of the upcoming open-track events. I will not be the driver of
|> the car, and was wondering if it would be legal to have a camera
|> broadcasting from a car that didn't have a licensed amateur in it as
|> long as I retained control remotely.
|>

stuff deleted.

```

|> | Andre Molyneux   KA7WVV      "Insert your favorite disclaimer here"      |
|> +-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+
|> |      -===== PYRAMID TECHNOLOGY CORP |Internet:      |
|> |      ----- 3860 N. First Street    | andrem@pyramid.com |
|> |      ----- San Jose, CA 95134      | Packet:          |
|> |----- (408) 428-8229                | ka7wvv@n0ary.#nocal.ca.usa.na |
|> +-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+-----+

```

I don't see why this should be illegal. It's just like the local ATVers here in Huntsville, AL have a remote camera mounted on Montesano mountain overlooking the city that is remotely controlled. In your case, the driver of the car is not the control operator. He's not operating the transmitter; he's driving the car.

Have fun! After all, thats part of what Amateur radio is all about....

```

Larry |^^^^^^|
      (|o) (o)|      Kilo Delta Four Yankee Delta Golf...at y'er service
===!!!=====U=====!!!=====

```

```

Larry D. Frost
AE EE Application Support ingr!b24a!ldf!larry
(205)730-8425      larry@ldf.b24a.ingr.com

```

Intergraph Corporation, Huntsville, AL 35894-0001

```

-----
Date: 12 Apr 1993 17:02:07 GMT
From: usc!cs.utexas.edu!tamsun.tamu.edu!cs.tamu.edu!kurt@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Remote control of ATV
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

```

In article <186072@pyramid.pyramid.com>, andrem@pyrtech.mis.pyramid.com (Andre Molyneux) writes:

```

|> I have a question regarding the ATV transmissions and whether or not
|> they can legally be controlled remotely. I'm a member of the
|> Nor-Cal Shelby club, and am hoping to set up an in-car camera at
|> one of the upcoming open-track events. I will not be the driver of
|> the car, and was wondering if it would be legal to have a camera
|> broadcasting from a car that didn't have a licensed amateur in it as
|> long as I retained control remotely.

```

To quote a sneaker advertising slogan: Just do it.

I assume that the driver doesn't have any control over it. Therefore,

you are in control.

It's a neat idea. Just do it.

73/Kurt

--

Kurt Freiburger, wb5bbw kurt@cs.tamu.edu 409/847-8607 fax:409/847-8578
Dept. of Computer Science, Texas A&M University DoD #264: BMW R80/7 pilot
"We preserve our freedom using three boxes: ballot, jury, and cartridge."
*** Not an official document of Texas A&M University ***

Date: Tue, 13 Apr 1993 02:26:19 GMT
From: sdd.hp.com!hpscit.sc.hp.com!hpuerca.atl.hp.com!der@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1375@wells.UUCP>, <C5C5LE.IEr@n3dmc.svr.md.us>,
<1993Apr12.054313.24570@news.acns.nwu.edu>
Subject : Re: Cable TVI interference

I wonder if it isn't appropriate to start looking for leakage with a portable TV - and explained to the bozos at the cable company that they have a lot more to lose in this conflict if there are complaints filed with the FCC regarding their leakage problem.

Also, I would suspect that it isn't too prudent for a company with pockets as deep as the typical cable outfit to go around slandering and defaming individuals - this is the sort of thing that isn't very smart.

-- Dave Ritchie N4DJS
der@hpuerca.atl.hp.com

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #94
